

REMARKS:

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated September 9, 2005, The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ammar, and rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Layson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of original claim 2 and one of the limitations of original claim 6. Claim 1 was amended to more clearly define the invention and not for reasons of patentability. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from new claim 1. Claim 6 has been amended to remove the limitation that was added to claim 1 as well as to overcome the 112 rejection. Claim 8 was amended to correct a typographical error.

Regarding the 102 rejection over Ammar, Ammar discloses a device to secure a muffler to a catalytic converter, not to a vehicle body. Ammar's holes 28, 30, 32, cited by the Examiner as allegedly anticipating the inventive car body side connecting means, are disposed on a bracket member 20 disclosed as being connected to catalytic converter 6 (see at least column 5, lines 12-13, and FIG. 1), not to a vehicle body. Ammar therefore does not disclose or suggest car body side connecting pins as set forth in both independent claims: amended claim 1 and original claim 7. Claims 1-8 are thus patentable over Ammar.

Regarding the 103(a) rejection over Layson, the Examiner cited a fragile and bendable bracket described in column 2, line 5, as allegedly anticipating the resilient hanger of the present invention. Applicant traverses the allegation that a fragile and bendable bracket and a resilient hanger are art equivalents. Assuming even for the sake of argument that the fragile and bendable bracket anticipates the resilient hanger of the present invention, which Applicant maintains it does not, the bracket is welded to an outlet collar of a catalytic converter (column 1 lines 42-43), not to a vehicle body. Layson therefore does not teach or suggest a resilient hanger comprising an insertion hole into which a car body side connecting pin is inserted, which limitation is in both independent claims: amended claim 1 and original claim 7. Claims 1-8 are thus patentable over Layson.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060945-0103)

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica C. Stahnke (Reg. No. 57,570)

for

Thomas D. Kohler (Reg. No. 32,797)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.442.1000

December 9, 2005

Date